

**Epilimnetic Phytoplankton and Zooplankton Biomass and Species
Composition In Lake Ontario, 1986 to 1992.**

Joseph C. Makarewicz¹, Theodore W. Lewis' and Paul Bertram²

¹Department of Biological Sciences
State University of New York at Brockport
Brockport, N.Y. 14420

'Great Lakes National Program Office
United States Environmental Protection Agency
Chicago, Illinois 60604

July 1995

Project Officer
Paul Bertram

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Great Lakes National Program Office
230 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604

ABSTRACT

Phytoplankton:

From 1986 to 1992, forty-two common species and varieties accounted for 91.1% of the total abundance and 88.2% of the total phytoplankton biomass. Mean biomass (mean \pm S.E.) for the spring and summer periods were 0.64 ± 0.07 g/m³ and 0.54 ± 0.03 g/m³, respectively, while abundance (mean \pm S.E.) averaged $2,788 \pm 225$ and $5,506 \pm 544$ cells/ml, respectively, for each respective season. Mesotrophic diatom species accounted for approximately $30.4 \pm 5.9\%$ (mean \pm S.E.) of the phytoplankton biomass while eutrophic diatoms represented less than $10 \pm 1.5\%$ of the phytoplankton biomass. No changes in the ratio of mesotrophic to eutrophic diatom species in Lake Ontario from 1970 to 1986 was observed. After 1987, an increase in the ratio occurred which suggested a reversal in eutrophy.

A decrease in summer phytoplankton biomass and a change in composition of the phytoplankton community has occurred since the early 1970's. Pyrrophyta relative biomass decreased from 1972/73 (3.1%) and 1981/82 (mean = 2.1%) to the 1986 -1992 period (mean = 10.2%). Specifically, biomass of Gymnodinium spp., Peridinium spp., and Ceratium hirundinella decreased in the summer plankton. Relative biomass of the chlorophytes and possibly the chrysophytes appear to have increased from the early 1970s and 1980s. For example, Chrysophyta biomass averaged 7.6% of the summer biomass from 1986 to 1992, but it increased from 4.1% of the relative summer biomass in 1986 to 12.4% in the summer of 1991. Species of Chromulina, Ochromonas, Chrysococcus and the Haptophyceae were observed in the 1986-1992 period that were not reported in 1981 and 1982. While Cryptomonas crocea biomass has not changed, summer biomass of Rhodomonas minuta decreased from >79 mg/m³ in the early 1970s and 1980s to less than 30 mg/m³ since 1990. Dominant diatom species

composition was similar to the 1970s, although there is evidence that Stephanodiscus alpinus was decreasing, while Aulacoseira islandica was increasing in biomass.

Historical trends in offshore phytoplankton biomass suggest a decrease in summer biomass since the 1970s and early 1980s that was directly correlated ($r^2=0.67$) with the decrease in spring, open water, total phosphorus concentrations. There is some evidence, although not strong, that the phytoplankton community may also be responding to top-down food web effects. For example, small unicellular phytoplankton ($< 50 \mu\text{m}$) decreased in relative biomass from 1986 to 1991/92 (76% to 38% - spring, 61% to 51% - summer), while relative biomass of filamentous and colonial algae increased from 1986 to 1992 (5% to 46% - spring, 24% to 38% - summer). In the spring, the decrease in large and small unicellular phytoplankton were directly correlated ($r^2=0.83$) and the increase in filamentous algae within the community were inversely correlated ($r^2=0.83$) with the increase in the abundance of the crustacean Limnocalanus macrurus.

Zooplankton: From 1986 to 1992, 65 species representing 38 genera from the Calanoida, Cladocera, Cyclopoida, Mysidacea and Rotifera comprised the offshore zooplankton community of Lake Ontario. Twenty-two common species plus their juvenile stages accounted for 97.6% of the total biomass and 96.0% of the total abundance. Average density and biomass for 1986-1992 (spring and summer) was $235.7 \text{ organisms/L} \pm 20.2$ (mean \pm S.E.) and $90.2 \mu\text{g/L} \pm 9.2$ (mean \pm S.E.), respectively. Biomass was higher in the summer ($164 \mu\text{g/L} \pm 13.9$) than in the spring ($9.8 \mu\text{g/L} \pm 0.7$). Within the pelagic region of Lake Ontario, abundance of smaller zooplankton species decreased and larger cladoceran, calanoid and cyclopoid species became more prevalent. Average length of the cladoceran species increased and was negatively correlated with alewife abundance. In particular, species of Daphnia (D. retrocurva and D.

galeata mendotae) and Bosmina longirostris increased in size by an average of 66% from their minimum mean length in 1987 to their length in 1991. The size of the small species that dominated the zooplankton community prior to 1990 suggested a community characteristic of planktivore-dominated systems where the fish feed selectively on larger individuals. Our data show that after 1990: 1) calanoids were more important in the pelagic region of Lake Ontario than they had been in 20 years; 2) smaller cladocerans decreased in abundance while increasing in size; 3) Daphnia were more prevalent and increased in size as an inverse function of alewife abundance; and 4) large predaceous cladoceran species were more prevalent than they had been prior to 1970. The zooplankton community of Lake Ontario has responded to changes in the forage fish community ultimately caused by continued predation pressure by salmonines.

INDEX WORDS: Lake Ontario, phytoplankton and zooplankton biomass and abundance, historical trends, eutrophication trends, food web changes.

DISCLAIMER: This report has been reviewed by the Great Lakes National Program Office, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and approved for publication. Approval does not signify that the contents necessarily reflect the views and policies of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract.....	ii
Disclaimer.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	v
List of Tables.....	vi
List of Figures.....	vii
Acknowledgements.....	viii
INTRODUCTION.....	2
METHODS.....	3
Phytoplankton.....	3
Zooplankton.....	5
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION - Phytoplankton.....	7
Annual Abundance of Major Algal Groups.....	7
Geographical Abundance and Distribution of Major Algal Groups.....	7
Historical Changes in Species Composition.....	8
Trophic Status.....	13
Trophic Dynamics.....	16
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION- Zooplankton.....	17
Annual Abundance and Biomass of Zooplankton Groups.....	17
Geographical Distribution of Zooplankton Groups.....	18
Historical Trends in Abundance.....	18
Historical Changes in Species Composition.....	19
Rotifera.....	19
Crustacea.....	20
General Discussion.....	23
LITERATURE CITED.....	27
TABLES.....	34
FIGURES.....	54
APPENDICES.....	70
Tables A1-A7: Summary of common phytoplankton species occurrence in Lake Ontario for each year (1986-1992).....	71
Table A8: Species List - phytoplankton.....	79
Tables A9: Species List - zooplankton.....	85
Table A10-A17: Summary of common zooplankton species occurrence in Lake Ontario for each year (1986-1992).....	89
Table A18 Changes in computer database.....	96
Table A19. Lake Ontario chemistry, 1986 to 1992.....	97

TABLE LEGENDS

	Page
Table 1. Lake Ontario phytoplankton and zooplankton sampling dates, 1986 - 1992.....	34
Table 2. Number of species observed in an algal division or grouping	35
Table 3. Number of genera observed in an algal division or grouping	36
Table 4. Summary of common phytoplankton species occurrence in Lake Ontario, 1986-1992.....	37
Table 5. Time trends at the division level in spring phytoplankton abundance and biomass, 1986-1992.....	38
Table 6. Time trends at the division level in summer phytoplankton abundance and biomass, 1986-1992.....	39
Table 7. Relative biomass of algal divisions in 1972, 1981, 1982 and 1986-1992..	40
Table 8. Average abundance and biomass for the spring and summer period, 1986-92.....	41
Table 9. Summary of common phytoplankton species from Lake Ontario, 1981....	42
Table 10. Summary of common phytoplankton species from Lake Ontario, 1982....	43
Table 11. Dominant diatom species in Lake Ontario, 1986-1992	44
Table 12. Time trends in spring and summer biomass of selected Lake Ontario phytoplankton	45
Table 13. Distribution of indicator diatom species in Lake Ontario over time.....	46
Table 14. Number of species and genera observed in each phylum of zooplankton..	47
Table 15. Summary of common zooplankton species occurrence in Lake Ontario during 1986 to 1991.....	48
Table 16. Time trends in zooplankton biomass and abundance of selected phyla in Lake Ontario (spring and summer data).....	49
Table 17. Time trends in zooplankton biomass and abundance of selected phyla in Lake Ontario, 1986- 1992 (spring data only).....	50
Table 18. Time trends in zooplankton biomass and abundance of selected phyla in Lake Ontario (summer data only).....	51
Table 19. Mean spring abundance for selected Crustacea species	52
Table 20. Comparison of abundance of selected species of Crustacea for the sampling period in August of 1970, 1972, 1981, 1982 and 1986-1991.....	53

FIGURE LEGENDS

	Page
Figure 1. Lake Ontario sampling stations, 1986-1992.....	54
Figure 2. Geographical distribution of spring and summer phytoplankton biomass.	55
Figure 3. Geographical distribution of selected phytoplankton divisions in Lake Ontario.....	56
Figure 4. Average relative biomass of eutrophic, mesotrophic and oligotrophic diatom species in Lake Ontario.....	57
Figure 5. Historical trends in offshore phytoplankton biomass in Lake Ontario.....	58
Figure 6. Regression of summer phytoplankton biomass on spring total phosphorus concentrations.....	59
Figure 7. Relative biomass of filamentous, colonial, and small and large unicellular algae.....	60
Figure 8. Relationship between <u>Limnocalanus</u> abundance and relative biomass of spring large and small unicellular algae.....	61
Figure 9. Yearly trends in relative biomass of selected phyla of zooplankton.....	62
Figure 10. Geographical distribution of zooplankton biomass in Lake Ontario.....	63
Figure 11. Geographical distribution of <u>Daphnia galeata mendotae</u> and <u>D. retrocurva</u> in Lake Ontario in 1991.....	64
Figure 12. Historical offshore zooplankton biomass trends in Lake Ontario during August.....	65
Figure 13. Annual weighted mean length of Cladocera, Cyclopoida and Calanoida in Lake Ontario.....	66
Figure 14. Relationship between alewife and smelt abundance and Cladocera, Calanoida and Cyclopoida length.	67
Figure 15. Annual weighted mean length of <u>Daphnia retrocurva</u> , <u>D. galeatae mendotae</u> and <u>Bosmina longirostris</u> , 1986-1991.	68
Figure 16. Number of alewife >164mm and rainbow smelt >149mm caught per standard trawl during the spring in U.S. waters of Lake Ontario.	69

Acknowledgments

The U.S. EPA Great Lakes National Program Office acknowledges the contribution to this study of personnel from the Bionctics Corporation (1983- 1990), AScI Corporation (1991- 1992) and EnviroScience (1993- 1994) for their assistance in the collection of samples and their taxonomic identifications of the phytoplankton and zooplankton species. Their perseverance onboard the R/V Roger R. Simons, and later on board the R/V Lake Guardian, under occasional severe weather and sea conditions is deeply appreciated. Also, their adherence to established protocols and standard operating procedures has ensured that the plankton collection, preservation and identification methods have remained consistent over the 10 years of this study.

INTRODUCTION

Results of the Food Web Workshop II (Hartig *et al.* 1991) indicated that Lake Ontario may be the next Great Lake after Lake Michigan to demonstrate the effects of changing nutrient levels and food web controls. Total phosphorus loads into the lake declined by 80% since 1972 and have approached the target loading set by the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreements between the United States and Canada. Spring total phosphorus levels declined from 25 to 14 $\mu\text{g/L}$ between 1971 and the late 1980s and are currently below 10 $\mu\text{g/L}$. Although declines in chlorophyll-a were relatively low and transparency has not changed appreciably, there is some evidence that algal biomass has declined. Besides changes in nutrient concentrations, changes in fish abundance has occurred as alewife, slimy sculpin and smelt biomass have decreased, while stocking of coho and chinook salmon increased from 40,000 to 5.4 million from 1968 to 1984 (Hartig *et al.* 1993, the rate of salmonine stocking was reduced (Luckey 1994)).

These changes in nutrient status and in the food web of the lake, and the potential for further appreciable change in the biota of Lake Ontario, have directed attention to the long-term data sets of phytoplankton and zooplankton collected by the Great Lakes National Program Office of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency as indicators of quantitative and compositional changes in plankton community structure. Phytoplankton, which have short carbon turnover rates, are sensitive to water quality conditions and to grazing by zooplankton and thus respond rapidly to perturbations of the lake ecosystem. The determination of phytoplankton abundance and species composition is one method to trace long-term changes in lakes (Munawar and Munawar 1982, Makarewicz 1993, Makarewicz and Bertram 1991). Similarly, whether aquatic ecosystems are perturbed by changes in the top predator fish that

cascade down the food web or by nutrients or by other stressors that are expressed from the first trophic level upward, the zooplankton are sensitive integrators of such changes (McNaught and Buzzard 1973). They have also proved useful for complementing phytoplankton data to assess the effects of water quality (Gannon and Stemberger 1978) and fish populations on biota (e.g. Brooks and Dodson 1965). The phytoplankton and zooplankton data sets collected by EPA's Great Lakes National Program Office provide such information and support the International Joint Commission's call for more and better information through monitoring and research on components of the Lake Ontario food web (Hartig *et al.* 1991). In this study, data about the 1986-92 spring and summer phytoplankton and zooplankton assemblages make it possible to examine the historical, geographic, and seasonal relationships prevailing in Lake Ontario and to compare them, where possible, to previous studies.

METHODS

Phytoplankton

Phytoplankton were collected during 23 cruises during the spring and summer from 1986 to 1992 (Table I). An 8-L PVC Niskin bottle mounted on a General Oceanics™ Rosette sampler with a Guildline™ electrobathythermograph (EBT) was used to collect phytoplankton. Phytoplankton samples were obtained by compositing equal aliquots of samples collected at depths of 1, 5, 10 and 20m at eight sampling sites (Fig. I). Thus our species data represent only summer epilimnetic forms and early spring isothermal forms. One-liter samples were immediately preserved with 10 mL of Lugol's solution and formaldehyde was added upon arrival in the laboratory. The settling chamber procedure (Utermöhl 1958) was used to identify (except for diatoms) and enumerate phytoplankton at a magnification of 500x. A second

identification and enumeration of diatoms at 1250x was performed after the organic portion was oxidized with 30% H₂O₂ and HNO₃. The cleaned diatom concentrate was air dried on a #1 cover slip and mounted on a slide (75x25mm) with HYRAX™ mounting medium. Replicate identifications were made by different analysts on every 10th sample and compared for consistency in species nomenclature and abundances. Precision goals between replicates were based on the Relative Percent Deviation ($RPD = ((\text{larger count} - \text{smaller count}) / \text{average}) \times 100$). For example, the precision goal for replicated Bacillariophyta counts was $\pm 15\%$. Values outside this goal were rejected and the samples recounted unless a clear explanation was available, e.g., very low abundance of forms in any one division. In addition, validation of species identifications between different enumerators over the 6-year period were made to ensure consistency in identifications. Changes in nomenclature, use of synonyms, etc. are discussed in Appendix A- IX.

The cell volume of each species was computed by applying average dimensions for each species from each sampling station and date to the geometrical shape that most closely resembled the species form, e.g., sphere, cylinder, prolate spheroid, etc. At least 10 specimens of each species were measured from each sample for the cell volume calculation. When fewer than 10 specimens were present, they were measured as they occurred. For most organisms, the measurements were taken from the outside wall to outside wall. The dimensions of the protoplast were measured for loricated forms, while the dimensions of individual cells were measured for filaments and colonial forms. Biovolume ($\mu\text{m}^3/\text{L}$) was converted to biomass (mg/m^3) assuming a specific gravity of 1.0 for all phytoplankton ($\text{mm}^3/\text{L} = \text{mg}/\text{m}^3$, Willen 1959, Nauwerck 1963).

The phytoplankton data were computerized. Statistical evaluations and other data manipulations were conducted within the INFO data management system (Henco Software, Inc. 100 Fifth Avenue, Waltham, Mass.). To allow an east-west comparison, Stations 49 and 55 on a north-south axis were averaged to form one site. Picoplankton were defined as rod or spherical shaped Cyanobacteria with a size less than 2 μ m (unicells or individuals within a colony). They were enumerated but were not included in this report because of very large numbers (e.g. 1986: 22,390 cells/ml, 88% of the total abundance), small biomass (e.g. 2.9% of the total biomass) and because of taxonomic uncertainties.

Zooplankton

A Wildco Model 30-E28 conical style net (62- μ m mesh net; D:L ratio = 1 :3) with 0.5-m opening (radius=0.25m) was used to collect a vertical zooplankton sample at the same stations (Fig. 1 and Table 1) at which phytoplankton were collected during 23 cruises during the spring and summer from 1986 to 1992. Only summer collections were made in 1989, and only spring collections were made in 1992. Vertical tows were taken from 20m to the surface. Filtration volume was determined with a Kahl flow meter (Model 00SWA200) mounted 1/3 of the net diameter from one edge. Following collection, the net contents were quantitatively transferred to 500-mL sample bottles, narcotized with club soda and preserved with 5% formalin.

Enumeration of zooplankton followed Gannon (1971) while identification followed Stemberger (1979) and Edmondson (1959). The volume of each rotifer species was computed by using the geometrical shape that most closely resembled the species (Downing and Rigler 1984). For each cruise, the length of at least 20 specimens of each rotifer species was measured. Width and depth were also measured on one date for each lake to develop length-width and length-depth ratios for use in the simplified formulas of Bottrell *et al.* (1976).

Assuming a specific gravity of one, volume was converted to fresh weight and to dry weight assuming a ratio of dry to wet weight of 0.1 (Doohan 1973) for all rotifer species except Asplanchna spp. A dry weight/wet weight ratio of 0.039 was used for Asplanchna spp. (Dumont et al. 1975).

Because of the considerable variability in length and thus weight encountered in the Crustacea, the dry weights of Crustacea were calculated using length-weight relationships (Downing and Rigler 1984, Makarewicz and Likens 1979). Up to 20 measurements of individual specimens were used to calculate the average length of crustacean species for each station of each cruise. A comparison of calculated weights to measured weights of individual Crustacea in Lake Michigan suggested good agreement at the minimum weight range (Makarewicz 1988). The weight of the Copepoda nauplii and the veliger of Dreissena followed Hawkins and Evans (1979) and Sprung (1993).

The zooplankton data were computerized. Statistical evaluations and other data manipulations were conducted within the INFO data management system (Henco Software, Inc. 100 Fifth Avenue, Waltham, Mass.). To allow an east-west comparison, Stations 49 and 55 on a north-south axis were averaged to form one site.

All phytoplankton and zooplankton identifications and enumeration were performed for the United States Environmental Protection Agency by the Bionetics Corporation (1983-88), ASci (1989,1990) and Enviroscience Corporation (1991-92).